



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

# Integrating environmental justice and socio-ecological models of health to understand population-level physical activity

### Citation for published version:

Shortt, N, Rind, E, Pearce, J & Mitchell, R 2014, 'Integrating environmental justice and socio-ecological models of health to understand population-level physical activity', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 46, no. 6, pp. 1479-1495. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a46113>

### Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1068/a46113](https://doi.org/10.1068/a46113)

### Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

### Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

### Published In:

Environment and Planning A

### Publisher Rights Statement:

Submitted for publication in Environment and Planning A (2014)

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



**Integrating environmental justice and socio-ecological models of health to understand  
population-level physical activity**

Niamh K Shortt <sup>1</sup>

Esther Rind <sup>1</sup>

Jamie Pearce <sup>1</sup>

Richard Mitchell <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Research on Environment, Society and Health (CRESH), School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH8 9XP, UK

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Research on Environment, Society and Health (CRESH), Section of Public Health and Health Policy, Faculty of Medicine, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8RZ, UK

# **Integrating environmental justice and socio-ecological models of health to understand population-level physical activity**

**Word count incl abstract and tables: 8589 excluding abstract and tables: 6870**

## **Abstract**

The uneven geographical distribution of environmental pathogens and salutogens, as well as the political, social and cultural antecedents leading to this socio-spatial arrangement, have been posited as a partial explanation for the stark inequalities in health across many high income nations. Whilst there is significant international evidence for the maldistribution of health-related environmental features, few studies have examined the material outcomes (including health) of this unequal environmental 'exposure'. In previous research we developed the Multiple Environmental Deprivation Index (MEDIx), an area-based measure that represented the multiple dimensions of health-related physical environments for census wards across the UK. Our earlier work demonstrated evidence of environmental *injustice* in the UK, as multiple environmental deprivation increased so too did the degree of income deprivation. Using mortality data we also found the poorest health outcomes in the most environmentally deprived areas.

In this paper, we utilise the theoretical stances offered by work in the fields of environmental justice and socio-ecological models of health to consider the pathway between physical environmental deprivation and health. We consider the influence of the '*natural*' physical environment on individual-level levels of physical activity, both utilitarian and physical activity for leisure.

We found that for physical activity, conducted for recreational purposes, there is a strong relationship with the natural physical environment, those living in the least deprived physical environments are most likely to engage in physical activity. However, for utilitarian physical activity, physical activity whose primary purpose is not the activity itself, we observe increased levels in the most environmentally deprived areas. The importance of the physical environment for physical activity may therefore differ with respect to the type of physical activity. Finally, this paper recognises the important role that the environment may play in shaping capabilities, particularly during the current economic and political climate. Our results show that the environment matters and rhetoric regarding 'lifestyle choice' needs to be viewed in a broader environmental context.

Key Words: Environmental justice, physical activity, health behaviours, socio-ecological model, capabilities

## **Background**

The notion that aspects of the physical environment may mediate and shape health inequalities is supported by a growing evidence base demonstrating that socially disadvantaged groups often reside in areas of poorer environmental quality. Using a framework of environmental justice, researchers have noted that low income communities suffer the burden of environmental disamenities such as poor air quality, noise pollution and exposure to toxic facilities (Jerrett, Burnett et al. 2001; Evans and Kantrowitz 2002; Walker, Mitchell et al. 2005). It is likely that the unequal access to a high quality environment and the political, social and cultural factors underpinning this arrangement may partly account for the variations in health outcomes across areas differentiated by social disadvantage. Whilst recognising this, research has rarely bridged the divide between

environmental justice and health related outcomes (Pearce, Richardson et al. 2010). In this paper we explore the influence of the '*natural*' physical environment on individual-level levels of physical activity. We define the '*natural*' physical environment as consisting of external physical, chemical, and biological dimensions, and excluding social and cultural dimensions.

Such critiques of environmental justice research focus on the traditional emphasis placed on descriptive accounts of the associations between environmental 'risks' and population factors. To this end the first wave of environmental justice research is characterised by a plethora of research demonstrating an unequivocal relationship between risky environments and populations of low socioeconomic status or racial minorities. More recently, researchers have called for a new environmental justice paradigm that explores the material effects of environmental (in)justice with risky environments seen as fundamental structural barriers in a person's ability to lead a healthful life (Taylor et al., 2007). Recast in this way research begins to query the health consequences of *experiencing* different environments, thus moving from description to outcomes.

Whilst emerging research in this field has sought to understand, if and how, features of the local environment are related to area level health inequalities (Pearce, Richardson et al. 2010), few have considered how the distribution of either pathogenic or salutogenic environments may influence health related behaviours. Such behaviours have been firmly established as proximate risk factors for poor health (World Health Organisation 2002) and their higher prevalence rates in lower socio-economic groups may be contributing to the growing inequalities in both mortality and morbidity (van Lenthe, de Bourdeaudhuij et al.

2009). Whilst explorations of such contextual effects on behaviours are not new, few have considered the natural physical environment and the ways in which issues of justice may be considered as a result of differential population exposure, related behaviours and health outcomes.

Understanding the disparate health behaviour related opportunities afforded to the population contributes towards the second wave of the environmental justice movement (Taylor, Floyd et al. 2007). Developing upon the first wave, concerned with the uneven distribution of polluting facilities, this second wave concerns itself more with health outcomes and the availability of health promoting environments (Taylor, Floyd et al. 2007). Such uneven distributions, and resulting related behaviours, raise questions of justice and accountability. It has been argued, within a health capabilities framework, that the ability to choose a healthier lifestyle is influenced by these external environments, formed by political and economic processes, which in turn shape an individual's ability to exercise their agency (Sen 1993). Such a capabilities perspective rejects the distributive approach and recognises different needs and outcomes.

There is an abundance of research demonstrating an association between the environment and health behaviours. Developing from a historical environmental deterministic perspective, researchers have moved beyond such theories towards a socio ecological view, exploring the *aggregation* of individuals and, investigating the ways in which the environment may modify, but not determine, an individual's health and well-being. Such a model recognises the relationships between people and their environments, with the environment seen as a consequence of social processes shaped by both individual and

group level interactions (Stokols 1992). As such we see clear linkages with environmental justice and the cultural, economic and political antecedents of environmental inequality.

A socio-ecological perspective, framed within the processes of environmental justice, helps us to reject environmental determinism and embrace a model where the individual interacts with their environment to influence health behaviours and health outcomes. Within such a model *place* is critical in any analysis of health-related behaviours and environment seen as both a facilitator and container of 'choice'. Emerging from this discourse recent work in health geography has looked towards socio-ecological theories, rejecting both environmental determinism and a life-style hypothesis, whilst recognising 'reciprocal causation' such that *'individuals and environments jointly contribute to behaviour'* (McLeroy, Bibeau et al. 1988). This approach acknowledges the differing layers of influence related to Bronfenbrenner's (Bronfenbrenner 1979) micro, meso, and exo environments but in particular develops Daniel Stokols' Social Ecology Model for Health Promotion (Stokols 1992). This model is based on four assumptions; that health behaviour and 'healthfulness' are influenced by personal attributes and features of the physical and social environments; that these environments are multidimensional and complex recognising their objective and subjective characteristics; that interactions occur at a variety of scales and a socio-ecological analysis must incorporate multiple levels and ideas from systems theory; and that not only do environments influence people, but people in turn influence their environments in a series of people-environment transactions. These transactions *'modify the healthfulness of their surroundings through their individual and collective actions'* (Stokols, 1992, p.8).

The interaction between the individual and the various environmental layers reflects the multi-dimensionality which could not be captured through a reductionist approach that

ignores contextual influences on behaviour. When focussing on health-related behaviours the approach allows one to incorporate issues of accountability and agency and, when considering the environments to which populations are exposed, we are forced to reflect on how these environments are *'born of egregious social policies, past and present'* p. 668 (Krieger 2001). A socio ecological approach, as suggested by Stokols, is therefore concerned with more than distributive justice, but rather on how the unequal distributions of health promoting environments relates to inequalities in outcomes, echoing current concerns held by scholars of environmental justice (Taylor, Floyd et al. 2007).

In previous research, exploring inequalities in outcomes, we found an ecological association between multiple physical environmental deprivation and health (Pearce, Richardson et al. 2010). We created a measure of the physical environment that included multiple exposures. Like the socioeconomic environment, the physical environment is multifactorial. Populations are not exposed to single environmental factors in isolation: they simultaneously experience multiple exposures. Different environmental exposures may have additive, synergistic or antagonistic effects on health outcomes and behaviours when experienced in combination (Sterner 1999). Thus, identifying areas experiencing multiple environmental deprivation may assist in clarifying environment and health relationships.

Our measurement of the environment included physical environmental factors with health relevance that are both pathogenic (i.e., with potential to damage health which were air pollution, proximity to industry and cold climate) and salutogenic (i.e., with potential to enhance or maintain health which were access to green spaces and UVB levels). Like area level socio-economic indices we amalgamated the data to create an area level index, the



Multiple Environmental Deprivation Index (MEDIx), which measured area level multiple *physical* environmental deprivation. Analysis showed that higher levels of multiple physical environmental deprivation were significantly associated with a greater risk of all-cause mortality, mortality from certain specific causes, and with self-reported morbidity, independently of the level of socio-economic deprivation (Pearce, Richardson et al. 2010) .

Whilst this study has made important methodological and empirical contributions to the literature on multiple environmental deprivation and health, the conclusions are based on ecological associations and the pathways linking multiple environmental deprivation to health outcomes, such as mortality, require further investigation.

In this paper we develop our earlier work to explore one particular pathway and consider the influence of the physical environment on individual-level levels of physical activity, both utilitarian (active transportation) and physical activity for leisure. We have chosen physical activity as increasing rates of obesity, coupled with increased levels of sedentary behaviours have meant that physical activity has gained greater prominence within both public health and health geography. It is well established that physical activity is important for health and well-being and that low levels of physical activity are of increasing concern (Surgeon General 1996). Physical inactivity is known to increase the risk of coronary heart disease, stroke, type 2 diabetes and certain cancers (Wen and Wu 2012). It is estimated that physical inactivity is responsible for 6-10% of deaths from major non-communicable diseases and 9% of all premature mortality (Lee, Shiroma et al. 2012). Despite this evidence base physical activity levels are low and the current recommendation of 30 minutes of physical activity on most days is not met by 60% of men or 70% of women in the UK (NHS Information Centre 2008).

The focus of the current study is England where research has reported regional differences in physical activity and associations with socioeconomic status (Gidlow, Johnston et al. 2006). Less well known is why these associations exist. The relationship between social class and physical activity is complex and patterned by structural, social, cultural and psychological environments. Various suggestions have been made for lower levels of leisure time physical activity amongst the most deprived populations including lack of health knowledge of the benefits of physical activity (Wardle and Steptoe 2003), cultural capital (Bourdieu 1985), lack of financial capital (Withall, Jago et al. 2011), time constraints (Withall, Jago et al. 2011), social norms (Mansfield, Ducharme et al. 2012) and lack of facilities in deprived areas (Estabrooks, Lee et al. 2003). Reflecting on the socio-economic divide in sports participation Eitzen (1996) comments that *'sport, just as other institutions of society, reflects the inequalities and injustices found in society'* (p.103).

Using physical activity as an example, we are therefore interested, not only in the spatial and social inequalities of individual level physical activity engagement, but also the drivers of these within the broader environment. Such an approach recognises that individual level attributes only explain between 20-40% of the variance in physical activity (Spence and Lee 2003) prompting exploration into how the local environment can provide opportunities for promoting or hindering engagement in physical activity. Building on such socio-ecological theories researchers have begun to contribute to this knowledge base, dividing the physical activity environment into two distinct areas; the built environment and the natural environment (Sallis 2009). A plethora of recent research has explored the association between physical activity levels and the built environment. Street connectivity, aesthetics,

lower crime rates, mixed land use, street lighting and public open space have all been found to have a positive influence on physical activity levels, although most of these studies have been confined to the United States (Saelens, Sallis et al. 2003; Owen, Humpel et al. 2004).

Whilst the relationship between physical activity and the environment is clearly a burgeoning field relatively few have considered the '*natural*' physical environment (Brownson, Baker et al. 2001; Humpel, Owen et al. 2002; Tu, Stump et al. 2004) being '*aspects of nature that could alter physical activity patterns, such as climate, weather*' (Sallis 2009). Research in this area has found negative associations between physical activity levels and air pollutant emissions (Zahran, Brody et al. 2008), rainfall (Winters, Friesen et al. 2007), cold temperatures (Winters, Friesen et al. 2007) and inclement weather (Nankervis 1999). Positive associations have been found with green space (Wendel-Vos, Schuit et al. 2004) and moderate weather (Zahran, Brody et al. 2008). Proposing physical ecology as a layer within their ecological model of physical activity, Spence and Lee recognise the possible influence that the *natural* physical environment may have on an individual's ability to engage in physical activity (Spence and Lee 2003). Whilst policy options to change such environments are limited, an understanding of the effects of the physical environment on physical activity may be equally important in generating our understanding of the correlates of such behaviours in order to support a shift in policy away from individual behavioural change towards environmental mitigation.

In this paper we extend previous research on physical activity and the environment in three ways. Firstly, we focus exclusively on the '*natural*' physical environment, building an evidence base alongside research on features of the built environment. Secondly, we extend previous analysis in this area that has focussed on a single environmental variable. We

would argue that the confluence of multiple environmental exposures is important as individuals are not exposed to single environmental attributes in isolation. Finally, our index includes aspects of the environment that may promote *and* hinder physical activity, thus reflecting every day experience. Our aim is to explore the influence of multiple natural physical environmental features, *in combination*, on individual levels of physical activity. To explore this we will join a multiple measure of the physical environment (MEDIx) to individual level responses from the Active People Survey to investigate the importance of broader structures for health behaviours and the implications of this for equity within a discourse of lifestyles and personal responsibility.

## **Methodology**

### *Environmental Variables*

To capture the multi-dimensional features of the physical environment we created MEDIx, an index including both pathogenic and salutogenic features akin to socio-economic measures of deprivation, such as Carstairs, that summarises factors that individuals may be exposed to at an area level. The pathogenic features of MEDIx are proximity to industrial facilities, cold climate and outdoor ambient air pollution. Salutogenic features are access to green space and levels of UV. Data collected for each of the 8 variables (listed in Table 1) were used to construct MEDIx and this data were rendered to CAS ward level. Ward level was chosen as the appropriate geography as such areas are large enough to preserve anonymity of the individuals in our survey analysis yet small enough to allow for sufficient environmental variability between areas (n = 7969, average population = 6166). The data

were then transformed into exposure quintiles with those in the highest exposure quintile for pathogenic factor scoring +1 and those in the highest exposure quintile for salutogenic factors scoring -1. Scores were then summed to create an exposure index which ranged from -2 (theoretically the least environmentally deprived wards) to +3 (theoretically the most environmentally deprived wards). More detail regarding the choice of environmental factors and how MEDix was constructed is available elsewhere (Richardson, Mitchell et al. 2009; Pearce, Richardson et al. 2010; Richardson, Mitchell et al. 2010).

Table 1: Data used to construct MEDix

Dimensions	Sub-dimensions	Data Source
Air Pollution	Air pollution Particular matter (PM10) Nitrogen dioxide (NO2) Sulphur dioxide (SO2) Carbon monoxide (CO)	AEA Technology [1 km grids, annual average concentrations, modelled from National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (NAEI) data, 1999 - 2006]
Climate	Average Temperature	Met Office UK Climate Impact Programme data (5 km grids, 1996 - 2003)
UV Radiation		UVB index calculated using Met Office monthly cloud cover data (1 km grid, 1991 - 2000) and latitude
Industrial Facilities	Locations of waste management and metal production/processing sites	European Pollutant Emission Register (EPER) (grid references, 2001 - 02)
Green Space		Generalised Land Use Database and CORINE land cover data (UK, 2000)

#### *Individual level measure of Physical Activity*

Covering the whole of England, the Active People Survey (APS) is the largest annual (telephone) survey series of self-reported recreational physical activity in Europe. It is commissioned by Sport England and includes key indicators on physical activity (PA) which are comparable across all survey years as well as a range of socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. Adults, aged 16+, are randomly selected using Random

Digit Dialling (RDD) and the Rizzo-method. The full methodology is described elsewhere (IPSOS MORI 2011). To increase the sample size for this analysis, we used pooled data from three surveys including the waves 2007/2008, 2008/2009, and 2009/2010 with a final sample of 573,626. A ward-level identifier was obtained for each of the APS-respondents which made it possible to link information on individual level-PA to MEDix.

#### *Individual level physical activity outcomes*

All PA outcomes were based on the number of days the activity was undertaken in the last 28 days preceding the interview and the usual amount of time spent doing the activity and the average perceived effort level. For example, a 30 minute walk was classified as “moderate activity” if the participants reported raised breathing rate, whereas “vigorous activities” make participants sweat and/or out of breath.

Based on the government’s recommendation for PA (30 minutes of moderate PA on at least five days/week) (Department of Health 2011), four binary PA outcomes were derived for this analysis. Respondents were identified who achieved the recommended physical activity levels (RPAL) through overall recreational PA including all activities reported. Furthermore, participants were identified who achieved RPAL through walking alone. As respondents were asked whether they undertook their walks particularly for the purpose of health or recreation, it was also possible to identify respondents who achieved the RPAL through recreational or non-recreational walking (including walking to and from work or for the purpose of shopping). We chose walking as it was the most common form of physical activity undertaken by survey respondents. We decided to subdivide walking according to recreational and non-recreational modes to determine if the relationship differed for

recreation that could be seen as voluntary and that which is carried out not for the primary purpose of recreation.

#### *Individual and area level covariates*

The APS also includes a variety of covariates that may be associated with PA. Those included were age-group (16 to 24, 25 to 44, 45 to 64, 65+), gender, ethnicity (White/non-White), presence of long-term limiting illness (yes/no), social class (6 categories) and household income (7 categories) (Trost, Owen et al. 2002; Gidlow, Johnston et al. 2006). Univariate analysis confirmed associations between physical activity and each of these covariates in our sample. Furthermore we controlled for interview season (Summer: 14 April to 14 October/ Winter: 15 October to 13 April) in our models as, although the survey took places throughout the year, respondents were more likely to be physically active in the summer months.

To adjust for area level socio-economic deprivation we included the ward level Carstairs Deprivation Index in our models. The Carstairs Index includes measures of overcrowding, unemployment among men, low social class and not owning a car (Carstairs and Morris 1991). We have used the Carstairs Index as a measure of area level socio-economic deprivation in previous environment and health research (Shortt, Richardson et al. 2011). We did not include a further measure of rurality due to a high degree of multicollinearity between rurality, Carstairs and MEDix.

#### *Assessing the implications of missing data*

We observed a high number of missing values for both household income (22%) and social class (8%). For all other variables the number of missing values was <2%. To explore the

implication of this for our analysis we ran 3 types of models. In the first we excluded respondents with missing data, in the second we ran models which included the missing data added as an extra category (Vogl, Wenig et al. 2012) and in the final model we imputed the missing data using Stata/IC 12.1 according to Lunt's guide to imputing missing data (Lunt 2011). Since the results did not vary in either direction of association or statistical significance we report results from our original models which exclude the respondents with missing data. Furthermore, Vogl et al. (2012) emphasise that imputation would induce additional bias in the analysis.

### **Statistical analysis**

Our final dataset comprised of 496,582 individual respondents with ward level quintiles of MEDix and Carstairs attached. We had 4 outcomes of interest; 1) whether the respondent met RPA through total physical activity, 2) whether the respondent met RPA through total walking, 3) whether the respondent met RPA through recreational walking and 4) whether the respondent met RPA levels through non-recreational walking. As the outcome variables were binary, we fitted logistic random effects regression models with maximum likelihood estimation, reporting odds ratios. Random-effect models are used analysing clustered data where the usual assumption of independence of the responses is not appropriate (Rabe-Hesketh et al., 2005; Rodríguez et al., 2003). The data used in this analysis have a two-level hierarchical structure with respondents achieving the recommended levels of physical activity through total physical activity or walking at level 1, nested within Caswards at level 2. All models were fitted in Stata/IC 12.0 using the xtlogit command. Models were built in 3 stages. In the first model we added MEDix to explore whether there was an association between the physical environment and physical activity before adjusting for confounders. In



the second model we added individual and household variables (age, sex, ethnicity, limiting long term illness, social class, household income). We also included our measure of seasonality in this model. In the third model we added the Carstairs Index to explore whether area level socio-economic deprivation attenuated the relationship between physical activity and environmental deprivation after controlling for individual level variables. To explore the influence of individual car ownership on the results, particularly walking, we further added this to models 2 and 3. As Carstairs also includes an area level measure of car ownership we only report this when there were significant changes to the results, on the whole the addition of car ownership did little to change the odds or the confidence intervals.

Due to small numbers in MEDix category +3 (the most deprived environments) we collapsed this category with MEDix +2. In our models we used MEDix 0, areas experiencing environments with an equal number of measured salutogens and pathogens, as our reference category. Testing for interaction between physical activity and confounding variables confirmed significant interaction with gender. As such we ran further models stratified by gender to separately explore the associations for males and females.

## **Results**

In the total sample just 10.7% of respondents met the recommended levels of weekly physical activity, this was slightly higher for males (11.8%) than for females (9.9%) (Table 2). 9.2% of survey respondents met the recommendations through walking alone, though this was slightly higher for females (9.5%) than males (8.8%), demonstrating the importance of walking as a form of physical activity. For those that we could determine as non-recreational

and recreational walking just 2.3% met the recommendations through non-recreational walking, slightly more males (2.6%) than females (2.1%).

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the physical activity outcomes, Active People Survey 2007 - 2010

<b>Physical activity (PA) outcomes</b> (30 minutes of moderate intensity activities at least five days/week)		<b>Total</b> n = 496,582		<b>Male</b> n = 204,023		<b>Female</b> n = 292,559	
		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>valid %</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>valid %</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>valid %</b>
Total recreational PA	no	439,387	89.3	178,427	88.2	260,960	90.1
	yes	52,562	10.7	23,759	11.8	28,803	9.9
	missing	4,633	0.9	1,837	0.9	2,796	1.0
Total walking	no	450,997	90.8	186,107	91.2	264,890	90.5
	yes	45,585	9.2	17,916	8.8	27,669	9.5
Recreational walking	no	471,332	94.9	194,893	95.5	276,439	94.5
	yes	25,250	5.1	9,130	4.5	16,120	5.5
Non-recreational walking	no	485,218	97.7	198,797	97.4	286,421	97.9
	yes	11,364	2.3	5,226	2.6	6,138	2.1

### *Overall levels of physical activity*

Before controlling for any individual, or area level variables, those living in the least environmentally deprived areas had a 40% increased odds (OR 1.40, CI: 1.32-1.48) of meeting RPA levels compared to those in MEDix 0, furthermore those in the most deprived environments had a 17% reduced odds (OR 0.83, CI: 0.80-0.87) (Table 3). These odds ratios changed little and remained significant in model 2 after controlling for individual level demographic factors (age, sex, ethnicity, limiting long term illness, social class, household income and seasonality). In the final model, which included MEDix, individual level demographic factors, seasonality and area level socioeconomic deprivation (Carstairs) the relationship was attenuated but remained significant, with an odds ratio of 1.36 (CI: 1.28-

1.45) in the least environmentally deprived environments and 0.92 (CI 0.88-0.95) in the most deprived environments (Table 3). In all models the environmental gradient remained with those in the least deprived areas more likely to achieve recommended levels of physical activity with the odds of this diminishing with greater exposure to worsening physical environments.

Table 3: Multilevel Logistic Regression models of total physical activity (including walking)

	<b>Model 1</b>			<b>Model 2</b>			<b>Model 3</b>		
<b>No. of observations (individuals)</b>	491,949			357,712			357,712		
<b>No. of groups (wards)</b>	7,932			7,931			7,931		
	<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	
		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>
<b>MEDix</b>									
-2 (least deprived)	<b>1.40</b>	1.32	1.48	<b>1.40</b>	1.32	1.50	<b>1.36</b>	1.28	1.45
-1	<b>1.11</b>	1.08	1.14	<b>1.11</b>	1.07	1.14	<b>1.09</b>	1.06	1.13
0	1.00			1.00			1.00		
+1	<b>0.88</b>	0.86	0.90	<b>0.90</b>	0.88	0.93	<b>0.94</b>	0.92	0.97
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>0.83</b>	0.80	0.87	<b>0.87</b>	0.83	0.91	<b>0.92</b>	0.88	0.96
<b>Age group</b>									
65+				1.00			1.00		
45-64				<b>1.62</b>	1.56	1.68	<b>1.64</b>	1.58	1.70
25-44				<b>2.01</b>	1.93	2.09	<b>2.04</b>	1.97	2.12
16-24				<b>2.79</b>	2.64	2.95	<b>2.84</b>	2.68	3.01
<b>Gender</b>									
Female				1.00			1.00		
Male				<b>1.04</b>	1.02	1.06	<b>1.04</b>	1.02	1.06
<b>Ethnicity</b>									
Non-White				1.00			1.00		
White				<b>1.50</b>	1.42	1.59	<b>1.47</b>	1.39	1.55
<b>Long-term limiting illness</b>									
Yes				1.00			1.00		
No				<b>2.02</b>	1.94	2.10	<b>2.01</b>	1.93	2.09
<b>Social class</b>									
V: unskilled occupations				1.00			1.00		
IV: partly skilled				<b>1.19</b>	1.09	1.31	<b>1.19</b>	1.09	1.30
IIIM: skilled manual				<b>1.30</b>	1.19	1.41	<b>1.29</b>	1.18	1.40
IIIN: skilled, non-manual				<b>1.24</b>	1.14	1.35	<b>1.22</b>	1.12	1.33
II: managerial				<b>1.43</b>	1.31	1.55	<b>1.41</b>	1.29	1.53
I: professional				<b>1.41</b>	1.29	1.55	<b>1.39</b>	1.27	1.53
<b>Household income</b>									

£0 to £15,599	1.00			1.00		
£15,600 to £20,799	<b>1.14</b>	1.09	1.19	<b>1.13</b>	1.08	1.18
£20,800 to £25,999	<b>1.19</b>	1.14	1.25	<b>1.18</b>	1.13	1.24
£26,000 to £31,199	<b>1.28</b>	1.23	1.34	<b>1.27</b>	1.21	1.32
£31,200 to £36,399	<b>1.32</b>	1.26	1.39	<b>1.30</b>	1.24	1.37
£36,400 to £51,999	<b>1.47</b>	1.41	1.52	<b>1.44</b>	1.38	1.49
£52,000 or more	<b>1.82</b>	1.75	1.89	<b>1.76</b>	1.69	1.83
<b>Seasonality</b>						
Winter - 15 Oct to 13 Apr	1.00			1.00		
Summer 14 Apr to 14 Oct	<b>1.13</b>	1.11	1.16	<b>1.13</b>	1.11	1.16
<b>Carstairs quintile</b>						
1 (highest deprivation)				1.00		
2				<b>1.08</b>	1.04	1.12
3				<b>1.14</b>	1.10	1.19
4				<b>1.19</b>	1.15	1.24
5 (lowest deprivation)				<b>1.19</b>	1.14	1.24
<b>OR significant <math>p&lt;0.01</math>, OR significant <math>p&lt;0.05</math></b>						

A significant gender interaction was found in the relationship between physical activity and MEDix. To explore this we ran stratified models for males and females. After controlling for our independent individual and area level variables females in the least environmentally deprived areas have 52% greater odds (OR 1.52, CI: 1.40 – 1.65) of achieving RPAL than those in MEDix 0, whilst with those in the most environmentally deprived areas less likely to (OR 0.88, CI: 0.83-0.94). The relationship between the physical environment and levels of male physical activity is in the same direction, with those in the least environmentally deprived areas having greater odds of achieving RPAL (OR 1.16, CI: 1.06-1.28) compared with those in the least environmentally deprived areas (OR 0.96, CI: 0.90-1.02), though marginally insignificant (Table 3a). Whilst these are separate models, and therefore not comparable, it could suggest that the environment has a stronger influence on female levels of physical activity.

Table 3a: Multilevel Logistic Regression models of total physical activity (including walking) by sex

	<u>Model 3 Females</u>			<u>Model 3 Males</u>		
<b>No. of observations (individuals)</b>	200,796			156,916		
<b>No. of groups (wards)</b>	7,928			7,927		
	OR	OR		OR	OR	
					upper	lower
<b>MEDix</b>						
-2 (least deprived)	<b>1.52</b>	1.40	1.65	<b>1.16</b>	1.06	1.28
-1	<b>1.15</b>	1.10	1.20	1.03	0.98	1.07
0	1.00			1.00		
+1	<b>0.93</b>	0.90	0.97	<b>0.95</b>	0.92	0.99
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>0.88</b>	0.83	0.94	0.96	0.90	1.02

**OR significant  $p<0.01$ , OR significant  $p<0.05$**  Model 3: MEDix, age, ethnicity, LLTI, social class, household income, seasonality and Carstairs deprivation.

### *Walking*

Following preliminary analysis of the data we chose to focus more closely on walking as a form of physical activity. Reasons for this were two fold. First, walking is largely an outdoor activity and MEDix was a measure of outdoor environments, as such if we expected to see a relationship between the physical environment and physical activity then we would expect to see this most strongly in outdoor activities. Furthermore our preliminary analysis of the data confirmed the importance of walking as a form of physical activity.

Before controlling for individual and area level confounders there was a significant odds of respondents meeting RPAL levels through total walking in the least environmentally deprived areas (OR 1.39, CI: 1.31, 1.48), with the relationship changing little after controlling for individual and area level independent (OR 1.40 CI, 1.31-1.50) (Table 4). Similar to total physical activity there was a reduced odds in the most environmentally deprived areas before (OR 0.87, CI: 0.83, 0.90) and after confounding (OR 0.90, CI: 0.86, 0.94). Again an

environmental gradient across all MEDix categories was evident. As with total physical activity the models were stratified by gender demonstrating again the strongest effect sizes for females (Table 4a). Females in the least environmentally deprived areas have 44% greater odds of meeting RPAL through walking (OR 1.44, CI: 1.32-1.57) with those in the most environmentally deprived areas have 11% reduced odds (OR 0.89, CI: 0.83-0.94). For men this reduced to an increased odds of 36% (CI 1.36, CI: 1.23-1.50) in the least environmentally deprived areas and a reduced odds of 8% (OR 0.92, CI: 0.85-0.98) in the most environmentally deprived areas.

Table 4: Multilevel Logistic Regression models of total walking.

	<b><u>Model 1</u></b>			<b><u>Model 2</u></b>			<b><u>Model 3</u></b>		
<b>No. of observations (individuals)</b>	496,582			360,289			360,289		
<b>No. of groups (wards)</b>	7,932			7,931			7,931		
<b>MEDix</b>	<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	
		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>
-2 (least deprived)	<b>1.39</b>	1.31	1.48	<b>1.40</b>	1.31	1.50	<b>1.40</b>	1.31	1.50
-1	<b>1.10</b>	1.07	1.13	<b>1.12</b>	1.08	1.16	<b>1.13</b>	1.09	1.17
0	1.00			1.00			1.00		
+1	<b>0.93</b>	0.91	0.96	<b>0.96</b>	0.93	0.99	<b>0.96</b>	0.93	0.99
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>0.87</b>	0.83	0.90	<b>0.90</b>	0.86	0.94	<b>0.90</b>	0.85	0.94

**OR significant  $p < 0.01$ , OR significant  $p < 0.05$**

Model 1: MEDix. Model 2: Model 1 plus gender, age, ethnicity, LLTI, social class, household income, seasonality. Model 3: Model 2 plus Carstairs deprivation.

Table 4a: Multilevel Logistic Regression models of total walking by sex.

	<b><u>Model 3 Females</u></b>			<b><u>Model 3 Males</u></b>		
<b>No. of observations (individuals)</b>	292,559			202,333		
<b>No. of groups (wards)</b>	7,929			7,928		
<b>MEDix</b>	<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	
		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>
-2 (least deprived)	<b>1.44</b>	1.32	1.57	<b>1.36</b>	1.23	1.50
-1	<b>1.15</b>	1.10	1.20	<b>1.09</b>	1.03	1.15
0	1.00			1.00		

+1	<b>0.96</b>	0.92	1.00	0.96	0.92	1.01
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>0.89</b>	0.83	0.94	<b>0.92</b>	0.85	0.98

**OR significant  $p<0.01$ , OR significant  $p<0.05$**  Model 3: MEDIx, age, ethnicity, LLTI, social class, household income, seasonality and Carstairs deprivation.

#### *Recreational and non-recreational walking*

Dividing walking into recreational and non-recreational activities, we witness conflicting results (Table 5). For recreational walking, once again before adjusting for any confounders, those in the least environmentally deprived areas have a greater odds of achieving RPAL (OR 1.72, CI: 1.60, 1.85) with those in the most deprived areas having reduced odds (OR 0.75, CI: 0.71, 0.80). After controlling for individual and area level confounders this was attenuated slightly (least deprived OR 1.59, CI: 1.46-1.72 and most deprived OR 0.86, CI: 0.81-0.92). The relationship between the physical environment and recreational walking (controlling for individual and area level confounders), was particularly strong for females with women 67% (OR 1.67, CI 1.51-1.85) greater odds of achieving recommended levels in the least environmentally deprived areas to (males in same category OR 1.45, CI: 1.28-1.65). As with overall physical activity we see an environmental gradient with the odds of meeting the RPAL through walking diminishing with increasing physical environmental deprivation.

The relationship with non-recreational walking and physical environmental deprivation ran in the opposite direction. Before adjustment those in the *most* environmentally deprived wards had greater odds of achieving RPAL through non-recreational walking (OR 1.10, CI: 1.02-1.19) compared with those in the average environments and those in the least environmentally deprived groups had reduced odds (OR 0.76, CI: 0.66, 0.88). Controlling for individual level factors attenuated this gradient (most deprived OR 1.08, CI: 0.99 – 1.18 and least deprived OR 0.84, CI: 0.70 - 0.99). In an additional model we further controlled for

individual level car ownership and saw the odds reduce further with only the areas in the second most deprived category (MEDix +1 OR 1.11, CI: 1.05 – 1.18) demonstrating a significant result. All of these results were largely reduced to insignificance once we controlled for area level socio-economic deprivation (most deprived OR 0.94, CI: 0.86 – 1.03 and least deprived OR 0.92, CI, 0.78, 1.10). A significant relationship did however remain between residence in the second most environmentally deprived group of wards and an increased likelihood of achieving their RPAL through non recreational walking (OR 1.10, CI: 1.03-1.16) and whilst increased odds remained after controlling for car ownership, they no longer remained significant (1.04, CI: 0.98 – 1.10).

There was again a gender difference in the relationship however. Whilst the association between achieving RPAL through non-recreational walking and physical environment deprivation for women adhered to the overall pattern just described, we found no significance for men.

Table 5: Multilevel Logistic Regression models of recreational and non-recreational walking.

	<b><u>Model 1</u></b>			<b><u>Model 2</u></b>			<b><u>Model 3</u></b>		
<b>No. of observations (individuals)</b>	496,582			360,289			360,289		
<b>No. of groups (wards)</b>	7,932			7,931			7,931		
	<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>		<b>OR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	
		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>		<b>upper</b>	<b>lower</b>
<b><i>Recreational Walking</i></b>									
<b>MEDix</b>									
-2 (least deprived)	<b>1.72</b>	1.60	1.85	<b>1.66</b>	1.53	1.80	<b>1.59</b>	1.46	1.72
-1	<b>1.19</b>	1.14	1.23	<b>1.18</b>	1.13	1.23	<b>1.16</b>	1.11	1.21
0	1.00			1.00			1.00		
+1	<b>0.78</b>	0.75	0.81	<b>0.83</b>	0.79	0.86	<b>0.88</b>	0.84	0.92
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>0.75</b>	0.71	0.80	<b>0.80</b>	0.75	0.85	<b>0.86</b>	0.81	0.92
<b><i>Non Recreational Walking</i></b>									
<b>MEDix</b>									
-2 (least deprived)	<b>0.76</b>	0.66	0.88	<b>0.84</b>	0.70	0.99	0.92	0.78	1.10



-1	<b>0.90</b>	0.84	0.96	0.98	0.91	1.06	1.03	0.95	1.11
0	1.00			1.00			1.00		
+1	<b>1.24</b>	1.18	1.30	<b>1.23</b>	1.16	1.31	<b>1.10</b>	1.03	1.16
+2/+3 (most deprived)	<b>1.10</b>	1.02	1.19	1.08	0.99	1.18	0.94	0.86	1.03

**OR significant  $p<0.01$ , OR significant  $p<0.05$**

Model 1: MEDIx. Model 2: Model 1 plus gender, age, ethnicity, LLTI, social class, household income, seasonality. Model 3: Model 2 plus Carstairs deprivation.

## Discussion

In this paper we explored the associations between the physical environment and physical activity. Our results demonstrate that the physical environment is related to overall levels of physical activity, total walking and recreational walking. Populations in the least deprived physical environments are more likely to achieve recommended physical activity levels through these activities, compared to those in the most deprived physical environments.

These results persist after controlling for individual and area level confounders.

Associations between non-recreational walking and physical environmental deprivation are, however, in the opposite direction. Those in the *most* environmentally deprived wards have a greater likelihood of achieving recommended physical activity levels through non-recreational walking.

The distinction between recreational and non-recreational modes of activity is supportive of research elsewhere suggesting that the relationship between the environment and physical activity is complex (Giles-Corti and Donovan 2002). For physical activity that is seen as voluntary, conducted for recreational purposes with enjoyment and health benefits in mind, there is a strong relationship with the physical environment, those living in the least deprived physical environments are most likely to engage in physical activity and more particularly in recreational walking. This demonstrates the importance of the environment

in supporting individual level capabilities. However, for utilitarian physical activity, physical activity whose primary purpose is not the activity itself, in this case non-recreational walking, we observe an increased odds in the most environmentally deprived areas.

This association between the environment, both social and physical, and physical activity reported here suggests that the environment could be seen as a mediator between socioeconomic position and health related outcomes (Ferrer and Carrasco 2010). The capability framework offered by Sen recognises individual choice and motivation as a determinant of behaviour, however, such choice and motivation is coupled with opportunity, or capability (Sen 1993). In a health context, such capability can be defined '*as the extent to which people have the opportunity to live the kind of life they value*' (Ferrer and Carasco 2010 p.455). When considering the results within this context it could be hypothesised that the lack of environmental opportunity, coupled with other area and individual level motivators, merge to see reduced likelihood of 'voluntary' recreational physical activity in more deprived physical environments. On the other hand, whilst those in the most deprived areas have greater odds of non-recreational walking, such an activity may not be chosen with health benefits in mind. Rather walking in such environments may be seen as a means to an end. Research has reported perceptions of walking as not being 'proper' exercise, rather it is understood as functional, not undertaken for health benefits (Darker, Larkin et al. 2007).

Supporting our findings of this inverse relationship research has found higher levels of active travel in more socio-economically deprived areas (van Lenthe, Brug et al. 2005). Our results also lend weight to existing suggestions that there may be different environmental correlates for recreational and non-recreational physical activity (Owen, Humpel et al. 2004)

and for different population groups. Whilst active travel may be promoted as a cost-effective and sustainable way of encouraging more deprived individuals to engage in physical activity, we must also consider the possible negative effects of exercising in deprived physical environments. Whilst it may be the case that these individuals will be exposed to higher levels of air pollution, and perhaps increased risk of accidents, research has demonstrated that overall the benefits of active travel by far outweigh any negative risks (Rojas-Rueda, de Nazelle et al. 2011).

Recognising the important role that the environment may play in shaping our capabilities and 'choices' is important, particularly during the current economic and political climate. A narrow focus on changing behaviours dominates despite evidence demonstrating that policies focussed on individuals, rather than at the population level, have had limited success (Mutrie and Woods 2003). Reflecting this, many governments in developed nations have embraced a policy mandate that largely focusses on the individual and in the UK this is reflected in such publications as the Government's White Paper, *Choosing Health: Making Healthy Choices Easier* (Department of Health 2004). This publication highlights the emphasis placed on choice rather than government led intervention aimed at improving population levels of physical activity. This is then mirrored in the general population's stigmatisation of obese and inactive individuals who are seen as '*architects of their own ill-health, personally responsible for their weight problems because of laziness and overeating*' (Puhl and Heuer 2010 p.1020). Such stigma threatens the health of obese individuals, reinforces unhealthy behaviours and increases health disparities within the population (Puhl and Heuer 2010). Querying blame and individual responsibility, geographers can move the debate towards a consideration of place, and in particular environmental and social justice.

There are limitations to our study. We could not determine whether the environment has an influence on physical activity indirectly, or directly. Whilst we have explored possible direct influences we cannot rule out psycho-social indirect influences of the environment on behaviours. The fact that fewer people in the most environmentally deprived environments are physically active at recommended levels may suggest competing demands and the need to prioritise other goals over physical activity rather than a direct influence of the environment itself (Powers and Faden 2006). Environmental and social deprivation combined may mean that opportunities to engage in recreational physical activity are greatly reduced for individuals disproportionately exposed to both. Previous research has highlighted the importance of perceived behavioural control, social and familial support, social norms, lack of time and competing demands (Giles-Corti and Donovan 2002; Spence and Lee 2003).

The survey we have used is cross sectional and whilst we have pooled together data from several years to boost our sample it remains cross sectional. As a result of this we cannot infer causality and in this paper, we report associations. In order to develop this further we could require a longitudinal approach that explores the association between the physical environment and physical activity over time. Linked to this is the changing nature of the environment through time, both physical and social (Mitchell and Norman, 2012). In our modelling approach we explored interactions by stratifying our models by gender, we do however recognise that there are other ways in which such interactions could be assessed. There are further limitations with the survey, specifically related to recall bias and self-report. The Active People Survey asks respondents to recall their physical activity over the

past 28 days and as such all of our results are subject to recall bias. Furthermore our measure of physical activity is self-reported with the possibility that some respondents may inflate their levels of physical activity whilst others may not report activities such as walking, perhaps not seeing this as part of physical activity. Finally, our measure of the physical environment was an objective one and we have no indication of the perception of these environments by residents. Further research could explore whether the ways in which the population perceive their environment is related to levels of physical activity.

Acknowledging the limitations of this study our results show that environment matters, even after controlling for individual level confounders, demonstrating that rhetoric regarding 'lifestyle choice' needs to be viewed in a broader environmental context. We have demonstrated that the physical environment is only significant to a point, the environment mattered differently for different types of people in different circumstances. Whilst less deprived physical environments may support leisure time physical activity, and in particular recreational walking, more deprived physical environments may be a barrier to such recreational physical activity but not so for non-recreational physical activity. This research demonstrates that a single policy approach is unsuitable; we cannot see physical activity as one single issue, rather different population groups in different areas will engage with different forms of physical activity for different reasons. Furthermore we would support Krieger in calling for a reformulation of terms such as lifestyle '*so as to end the practice of obscuring or misclassifying agency*' p.899 (Krieger 1994 ). This raises issues of social justice and calls into question the level of freedom an individual may have to choose healthy behaviours. This reframing of choice and responsibility relates to growing

inequalities in health and acknowledges that individual level physical activity interventions will not be felt evenly across all sectors of society and the extent to which they are successful will be dependent upon both the physical and social environments in which people live. Evidence elsewhere on individual level 'soft' initiatives would suggest that the complexity of health related behavioural issues requires a coordinated effort at various levels to support individual capabilities without resulting in an 'inequality paradox' (Frolich and Potvin 2008).

### Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the ESRC grant reference RES-000-22-3974. The development of MEDix was supported by the Joint Environment and Human Health Programme, (grant number [NE/E008720/2](#)) which was funded by the UK's Natural Environment Research Council, the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs, the Environment Agency, the Ministry of Defence and the Medical Research Council. We are grateful to Dr Elizabeth Richardson who spent time on related analysis early in the project.

### References

Bourdieu, P. (1985). "HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL PREREQUISITES OF MODERN SPORTS." Merkur-Deutsche Zeitschrift Fur Europaisches Denken **39**(7): 575-590.

Brofenbrenner, U. (1979). The Ecology of Human Development. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.

Brownson, R. C., E. A. Baker, et al. (2001). "Environmental and policy determinants of physical activity in the United States." American Journal of Public Health **91**(12): 1995-2003.

Carstairs, V. and R. Morris (1991). Deprivation and health in Scotland. Aberdeen, Aberdeen University.

Darker, C. D., M. Larkin, et al. (2007). "An exploration of walking behaviour - An interpretative phenomenological approach." Social Science & Medicine **65**(10): 2172-2183.

Department of Health (2004). Choosing Health: Making healthy choices easier. London, Department of Health.

Department of Health (2011) Fact Sheet 4: Physical activity guidelines for Adults (19–64 years).

Estabrooks, P. A., R. E. Lee, et al. (2003). "Resources for physical activity participation: Does availability and accessibility differ by neighborhood socioeconomic status?" Annals of Behavioral Medicine **25**(2): 100-104.

Evans, G. W. and E. Kantrowitz (2002). "Socioeconomic status and health: the potential role of environmental risk exposure." Annu Rev Public Health **23**: 303-331.

Ferrer, R. L. and A. V. Carrasco (2010). "Capability and Clinical Success." Annals of Family Medicine **8**(5): 454-460.

Frolich, K. L. and L. Potvin (2008). "The inequality paradox: the population approach and vulnerable populations." American Journal of Public Health **98**: 216-221.

Gidlow, C., L. H. Johnston, et al. (2006). "A systematic review of the relationship between socio-economic position and physical activity." Health Education Journal **65**: 338-367.

Giles-Corti, B. and R. Donovan (2002). "The relative influence of individual, social and physical environment determinants of physical activity." Soc Sci Med **54**: 1793 - 1812.

Humpel, N., N. Owen, et al. (2002). "Environmental factors associated with adults' participation in physical activity - A review." American Journal of Preventive Medicine **22**(3): 188-199.

IPSOS MORI (2011). Active People Surveys 2, 3 and 4 and DCMS culture boost. Technical Report Final Version.

Jerrett, M., R. T. Burnett, et al. (2001). "A GIS - environmental justice analysis of particulate air pollution in Hamilton, Canada." Environment and Planning A **33**: 955-973.

Krieger, N. (1994 ). "Epidemiology and the web of causation: Has anyone seen the spider?" Social Science & Medicine **39**(7): 887-903.

Krieger, N. (2001). "Theories for social epidemiology in the 21st century: an ecosocial perspective." International Journal of Epidemiology **30**: 668-677.

Lee, I.-M., E. J. Shiroma, et al. (2012). "Effect of physical inactivity on major non-communicable disease worldwide: an analysis of burden of disease and life expectancy." The Lancet.

Lunt, M. (2011). A Guide to Imputing Missing Data with Stata. Revision: 1.4.

Mansfield, E. D., N. Ducharme, et al. (2012). "Individual, social and environmental factors influencing physical activity levels and behaviours of multiethnic socio-economically disadvantaged urban mothers in Canada: A mixed methods approach." International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity **9**.

McLeroy, K. R., D. Bibeau, et al. (1988). "An Ecological Perspective on Health Promotion Programs." Health Education Quarterly **15**(4): 351-377.

Mutrie, N. and C. H. c. w. g. p. t. b. m. a. A. p. w. t. b. s. Woods (2003). How can we get people to be more active? A problem waiting to be solved. Perspectives on health and exercise. J. McKenna and C. Riddoch. London, Palgrave MacMillan.

Nankervis, M. (1999). "The effect of weather and climate on bicycle commuting." Transportation Research Part a-Policy and Practice **33**(6): 417-431.

NHS Information Centre (2008). "Health Survey for England 2006: CVD and risk factors adults, obesity and risk factors children."

Owen, N., N. Humpel, et al. (2004). "Understanding environmental influences on walking - Review and research agenda." American Journal of Preventive Medicine **27**(1): 67-76.

Pearce, J., E. A. Richardson, et al. (2010). "Environmental justice and health: the implications of the socio-spatial distribution of multiple environmental deprivation for health inequalities in the United Kingdom." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers **35**(4): 522-539.

Powers, M. and R. Faden (2006). Social justice: the moral foundations of public health and health policy. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Puhl, R. M. and C. A. Heuer (2010). "Obesity Stigma: Important Considerations for Public Health." American Journal of Public Health **100**(6): 1019-1028.

Richardson, E. A., R. J. Mitchell, et al. (2010). "Developing summary measures of health-related multiple physical environmental deprivation for epidemiological research." Environment and Planning A **42**: 1650-1668.



Richardson, E. A., R. J. Mitchell, et al. (2009). "Evidence-based selection of environmental factors and datasets for measuring multiple environmental deprivation in epidemiological research." Environmental Health **8**(S18).

Rojas-Rueda, D., A. de Nazelle, et al. (2011). "The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: health impact assessment study." British Medical Journal.

**343.**

Saelens, B. E., J. F. Sallis, et al. (2003). "Environmental correlates of walking and cycling: Findings from the transportation, urban design, and planning literatures." Annals of Behavioral Medicine **25**(2): 80-91.

Sallis, J. F. (2009). "Measuring Physical Activity Environments: A Brief History." American Journal of Preventive Medicine **36**(4): S86-S92.

Sen, A. (1993). Capability and Well-being. The Quality of Life. M. C. Nussbaum and A. Sen. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 30-54.

Shortt, N. K., E. A. Richardson, et al. (2011). "Re-engaging with the physical environment: a health related environmental classification of the UK." Area **43**: 76-87.

Spence, J. C. and R. E. Lee (2003). "Toward a comprehensive model of physical activity." Psychology of Sport and Exercise **4**: 7-24.

Sterner, O. (1999). Chemistry, Health and Environment. Weinheim, Wiley-VCH.

Stokols, D. (1992). "ESTABLISHING AND MAINTAINING HEALTHY ENVIRONMENTS - TOWARD A SOCIAL ECOLOGY OF HEALTH PROMOTION." American Psychologist **47**(1): 6-22.

Surgeon General (1996). Physical Activity and Health: A Report of the Surgeon General, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Taylor, W. C., M. F. Floyd, et al. (2007). "Environmental Justice: A Framework for Collaboration Between the Public Health and Parks and Recreation Fields to Study Disparities in Physical Activity." Journal of Physical Activity & Health **4**(Supp 1): S50-S63.

Trost, S. G., N. Owen, et al. (2002). "Correlates of adults' participation in physical activity: review and update." Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise **34**: 1996-2001.

Tu, W., T. E. Stump, et al. (2004). "The effects of health and environment on exercise-class participation in older, urban women." Journal of Aging and Physical Activity **12**: 480-496.

van Lenthe, F. J., J. Brug, et al. (2005). "Neighbourhood inequalities in physical inactivity: the role of neighbourhood attractiveness, proximity to local facilities and safety in the Netherlands." Social Science & Medicine **60**(4): 763-775.

van Lenthe, F. J., I. de Bourdeaudhuij, et al. (2009). "Preventing socioeconomic inequalities in health behaviour in adolescents in Europe: Background, design and methods of project TEENAGE." Bmc Public Health **9**.

Vogl, M., C. M. Wenig, et al. (2012). "Smoking and health-related quality of life in English general population: implications for economic evaluations." BMC Public Health **12**: 203.

Walker, G., G. Mitchell, et al. (2005). "Industrial pollution and social deprivation: Evidence and complexity in evaluating and responding to environmental inequality " Local Environment **10**: 361-377.

Wardle, J. and A. Steptoe (2003). "Socioeconomic differences in attitudes and beliefs about healthy lifestyles." Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health **57**(6): 440-443.

Wen, C. P. and X. Wu (2012). "Stressing harms of physical inactivity to promote exercise." The Lancet.

Wendel-Vos, G. C. W., A. J. Schuit, et al. (2004). "Factors of the physical environment associated with walking and bicycling." Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise **36**(4): 725-730.

Winters, M., M. C. Friesen, et al. (2007). "Utilitarian bicycling a multilevel analysis of climate and personal influences." American Journal of Preventive Medicine **32**(1): 52-58.

Withall, J., R. Jago, et al. (2011). "Why some do but most don't. Barriers and enablers to engaging low-income groups in physical activity programmes: a mixed methods study." Bmc Public Health **11**.

World Health Organisation (2002). The world health report: reducing risks, promoting health. Geneva, WHO.

Zahran, S., S. D. Brody, et al. (2008). "Cycling and walking: Explaining the spatial distribution of healthy modes of transportation in the United States." Transportation Research Part D-Transport and Environment **13**(7): 462-470.